UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/1179
16 December 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

IDENTICAL LETTERS DATED 15 DECEMBER 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 15 December 1998 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, concerning the remarks made on 8 December 1998 by Sandy Berger, the United States national security adviser, which expose the fact that the United States is exploiting the United Nations and the Security Council and its resolutions to further the United States policy of hostility towards Iraq. The Minister urges the Security Council to meet its responsibility to prevent actions such as these, which are incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Nizar HAMDOON
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-39678 (E) 171298

/...

Annex

Identical letters dated 15 December 1998 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I should like at the outset to refer to my letters dated 19 October 1998 (S/1998/965, annex) and 30 November 1998 (S/1998/1130, annex). In those two letters, I informed the Security Council in abundant detail of the egregious political and military actions that were being taken by the Government of the United States of America against Iraq's sovereignty, security, territorial integrity and political independence. I further exposed the falsity of the pretexts to which the United States Government resorted in claiming that when it used its military forces against Iraq it was acting on the basis of the relevant Security Council resolutions. Recent events, particularly those of 14 November 1998 and the few weeks since then, have provided a strong indication of the truthfulness and accuracy of the statements made in our two letters. The official statement made by United States President Clinton on 15 November 1998 confirmed that his Government is using all possible ways and means of changing the legitimate national political regime in Iraq, including the use of armed force and the allocation of the funds necessary to recruit murderers, mercenaries and agents to implement this official United States policy. This admission by the United States President has been followed by other acknowledgements made in official statements by a number of United States officials, including heads of government departments and military leaders.

In the present letter, I should like to draw your attention and that of all of the members of the Security Council to further evidence to be added to the compelling evidence we have previously communicated to the Council. This evidence confirms not only that the Government of the United States of America has conspired against Iraq, used brute force in attacking it and interfered in its internal affairs for its own particular purposes but also that the United States Government harbours contempt for the Security Council and makes use of the Council's resolutions to further the goals of the United States policy of hostility towards Iraq. On Tuesday, 8 December 1998, Sandy Berger, the United States national security adviser, presented some remarks at Stanford University in California that contained a number of egregious admissions with regard to Iraq and the Security Council resolutions imposed on it, some of which are described hereunder.

1. Sandy Berger acknowledged that the sanctions first imposed on Iraq more than eight years ago are the most stringent in history and went on to confirm that it is the United States of America that has maintained these sanctions for more than eight years because they constitute one of four "pillars" on which the United States strategy for containing Iraq has been based.

The remarks of Sandy Berger, the United States national security adviser, are abundantly clear and require no commentary. They confirm the blatant and thorough exploitation of the Security Council and its resolutions and of the so-called international community and the use made of all of them in furthering the hostile United States policy against Iraq and its people.

Sandy Berger confirms in a manner that leaves no room for equivocation that the most stringent embargo known to history, which was imposed on Iraq in the name of the Security Council more than eight years ago and has caused the deaths of more than a million Iraqi citizens, was in truth imposed by the Government of the United States of America as part of a purely American strategy that bears no relation to the Security Council or to any so-called Gulf crisis.

2. In his remarks, Sandy Berger acknowledges that the American strategy for the so-called containment of Iraq, of which the embargo imposed on Iraq in the name of the Security Council constitutes one of the "pillars", is one that cannot be maintained over the long term. The United States Government has therefore begun to focus its efforts, openly and officially, on what it had previously been doing clandestinely, namely its ongoing endeavour by all possible means to interfere in the internal affairs of Iraq and to use armed force against it in order to overthrow its national political regime. They have failed in this, and their wretched scheme has been thwarted. Sandy Berger has characterized the involvement of the United States Government in this criminal activity against Iraq as the choice that the United States Administration must make with patience and resolve as well as with determination to use effective force to achieve the goal.

3. United States national security adviser Sandy Berger presents a lengthy exposition of the scenario for the United States policy against Iraq that makes use of the Security Council and its resolutions for its own furtherance. He extends an invitation to those whom he imagines will come together at his abortive call with the intention of seducing them. He also fancies in his sick imagination that when the United States Government succeeds through the use of "effective force" against Iraq in overthrowing the national regime and installing a government in Baghdad that is Washington's client, the United States of America will reward this government residing in Sandy Berger's diseased imagination by the following:

(a) Easing the economic sanctions maintained against Iraq since August 1990;

(b) Relieving Iraq's massive debts.

These are the real topics of the remarks made by Sandy Berger, the United States national security adviser. They were presented in the midst of a torrent of lies, of immorality and dishonour and of the empty allegations and bravado that customarily characterize the leaders and officials of the United States of America.

Before addressing you in the context of your responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations and international law and in order to forestall any erroneous interpretation of our position, we should like to state that we have not prepared the present letter for you because Iraq fears the fabrications of the despotic rulers of the United States or because it is intimidated or alarmed by the aggressive and conspiratorial actions of the United States against its security, sovereignty, freedom and independence. For the past 30 years, and during the last 10 years in particular, a long procession of American rulers have tried their faltering luck at conspiring against Iraq, and their

failure in doing so has always been abject owing to the protection of Almighty God and the worthy stance taken by the great people of Iraq. The basic reason we raise this subject is rather to call the attention of certain members of the Security Council, particularly its permanent members, to the contempt in which they are held by the United States, and we do this in order to learn whether they will tolerate it or will reject it in consideration of their responsibilities towards their peoples and the role accorded them by their legal duty.

We condemn and deprecate these hostile acts on the part of the United States against our country and our people. We call upon the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter and international law, to denounce the hostile and conspiratorial statements and actions directed against Iraq and to fulfil its responsibility under the Charter to prevent them and to bring those responsible for them to account.

At the same time, however, we affirm that neither the statements of Berger and others nor the conspiring and hostile actions of the United States can sap the loftiness of even a single one of Iraq's great palm trees or its pride in the stance taken by the great people of Iraq. The American aggressors may have the ability to destroy an Iraqi date palm by dropping their bombs or by firing missiles at it, but while it lives they will fail abjectly to bow its majestic head. They shall not succeed, however great their tyranny and might, in undermining the faith, steadfastness and firmness of the mighty people of Iraq. American officials, whoever they may be and whether they like it or not, can only respect Iraq and can only respect its political regime.

On many occasions and in all manner of forums Iraq has maintained that the United States of America has always regarded diplomacy (in its true sense as customarily accepted among States), international law and the United Nations (as understood in accordance with its Charter) as inconvenient obstacles except when it is possible to utilize them as instruments for the furtherance of United States policy against one country or another at the whim of the rulers in Washington. Some, for one reason or another, would engage in sophistry and would deny this fact.

The remarks of Sandy Berger, the United States national security adviser, leave no room for further sophistries or denials. More than that, however, they raise many legitimate questions and prompt deep concern among all fair-minded people in the world.

As members of the Security Council, do you not find Sandy Berger's remarks embarrassing to you, first as States and then as an international institution called "the Security Council"? The remarks of the United States national security adviser give no weight to the desires of the Security Council as an international institution or of its individual members. Sandy Berger states unequivocally that the Council's resolutions, regardless of any assessment of the injustice, unfairness and arbitrariness they may contain, are under the authority of the Government of the United States of America and that it is that Government that determines their form and controls their implementation, because they constitute the "pillars" of its strategy.

It is the United States of America, as acknowledged by the United States national security adviser in his remarks, that has maintained in place against Iraq for more than eight years the most stringent sanctions in history, and it has done so because these sanctions are one of the four "pillars" that constitute the United States strategy directed against Iraq. Sandy Berger says that it is Washington that will determine whether or not the embargo against Iraq will continue to be enforced, in accordance with the requirements of United States policy. Are the distinguished members of the Security Council not deeply embarrassed by the public announcement of this fact by the United States national security adviser?

The United States of America is formally declaring, through its most senior officials and in all the electronic and print media throughout the world, that it is officially interfering in Iraq's internal affairs and that it is allocating tens and perhaps hundreds of millions of United States dollars and using effective military force in order to overthrow the legitimate national political regime in Iraq. The Security Council nevertheless takes refuge in total silence while all of its members, even the representative of the United States of America himself, know perfectly well that this policy of the United States and its hostile actions against Iraq are in flagrant violation of all the principles and norms of international law, particularly those of the Charter of the United Nations, and even of the Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq.

Are the members of the Security Council not deeply embarrassed, first by the persistence of the United States Government in violating international law and the Council's resolutions and then by the fact that the Council should remain silent in the face of such contentiousness on the part of the United States?

The recklessness of the United States is an affront to the international community, and the silence of the Security Council in the face of this recklessness is an affront to the United Nations. It is our firm belief that this silence cannot be permitted to continue in view of the grave negative and destructive consequences it may have for the integrity of the United Nations and the principles of its Charter.

The United States of America acknowledges, through the United States national security adviser, that the Government of the United States of America will decide to ease the economic sanctions imposed on Iraq if there is a government in Baghdad that is Washington's client. Could contempt for the Security Council and its resolutions be any greater than this? Could there be a more painful usurpation of the wishes of the other members of the Council than this by the United States?

Even worse than the foregoing is Sandy Berger's statement that if the United States succeeds in overthrowing the national political regime in Iraq and installs a client government in Baghdad then Washington will work to relieve Iraq's debts, which he characterizes as "massive". For the information of the members of the Security Council, Iraq is not indebted to the United States of America. The statement of the United States national security adviser is therefore meaningless other than as an implicit allusion to the question of

compensation and as an attempt to cause deliberate confusion between debts and compensation payments.

Sandy Berger's remarks shed light on the fact that the hostile policy of the United States towards Iraq transforms the Security Council resolutions relating to economic sanctions and compensation arrangements into measures that bring into being imaginary clients and seduce them by means of decisions to be taken in Washington to ease the economic sanctions and mitigate the payment of compensation, both of them measures imposed on Iraq in the name of the Security Council, in the event that these clients should agree to function as instruments of United States agencies in overthrowing the political regime in Iraq.

The crux of the matter is that the United States national security adviser is saying with brutal frankness that it is Washington that will conduct the "review", that the real power of decision is in its hands and that the other members of the Security Council are excluded.

In the past eight years Iraq has frequently complained of arbitrariness on the part of the United States. It has told you that the resolutions adopted against it by the Security Council, with all their injustice and arbitrariness, were not the work of the other members of the Council or the outcome of their wishes but were imposed by brutal force by the United States of America. The responses we received would deny the truthfulness of what we had said and enumerate a variety of excuses. Today, confirmation is being provided by United States officials of the truthfulness of Iraq's statements and warnings. They are declaring frankly that the economic sanctions imposed on Iraq are United States policy and that these sanctions will be maintained because they are an instrument for the overthrow of the national regime in Iraq alongside other mechanisms such as the use of military force to attack Iraq under cover of requiring Iraq to implement the resolutions of the Security Council and such as the allocation of funds for the recruitment of agents and mercenaries to help achieve the goals of United States policy against Iraq. What, though, do the distinguished members of the Security Council say now, when all of these bitter truths have been revealed?

Why do the other members of the Security Council not adopt measures that are based on the Charter and on international law and that are clear to us and to the entire world? Why do they not adopt measures that restore justice and truth to their proper place, or that at least curb unrestrained falsehood, and that release the people of Iraq from all the oppression and injustice that have now beset it for more than eight years? Such measures should be in keeping with the positions taken by the members of the Council, and particularly its permanent members, in accordance with their responsibilities under the Charter and international law, so as to demonstrate that they really are members of an international institution that functions and conducts itself in word and deed in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law and that it is not the case, as United States national security adviser Sandy Berger says, that the Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq are in reality instruments for the implementation of the United States policy of hostility to Iraq and to its people.

These are legitimate questions, and we strongly believe that they not only express the position and sentiments of the leadership and people of Iraq but also reflect those of the overwhelming majority of the world's countries and peoples. Perhaps the distinguished members of the Council will take concrete steps and adopt positions such as will affirm that the claim made by United States national security adviser Sandy Berger is no longer possible to the extent that it depends on the wishes of the other members of the Security Council.

I request you to bring this letter to the attention of the members of the Security Council and to have it circulated as a Council document.

(Signed) Mohammed Said AL-SAHAF
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Iraq

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/1180
16 December 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 15 DECEMBER 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF UGANDA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to reply to the memorandum of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, circulated as document S/1998/1146, and to request that this reply be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Prof. SEMAKULA KIWANUKA Ph.D.
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of Uganda
to the United Nations

98-39660 (E) 171298

/...

Annex

Letter from the Permanent Representative of Uganda replying to the memorandum dated 2 December 1998 from the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

The Government of Uganda categorically refutes the baseless allegations, made in the above-mentioned memorandum, that Uganda has committed crimes against humanity and engaged in human rights violations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Below we shall give a gruesome picture of the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo based on investigations by international agencies. We shall show that it is the authorities in that country who have committed grave human rights violations against their own people.

Today it is internationally acknowledged by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and many other international rights and humanitarian agencies that, since coming to power, the Kabila regime has been responsible for gross human rights abuses in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In order to hide these gross violations, the authorities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are looking for scapegoats. The fact of the matter is that the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is an internal crisis that has spun out of control because of the absence of an effective democratic government at the centre.

The conflict began in the towns of Goma and Bukavu in August 1998. Since then, Democratic Republic of the Congo government forces are reported by Amnesty International to have made arbitrary and unlawful arrests and killed hundreds of Congolese because of their ethnic origins. Government officials as well as the media have repeatedly incited the populace to attack the Tutsi. For example, on 8 August 1998, radio broadcasts incited listeners to jump on the people with long noses.

At the ministerial meeting on the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo held in Lusaka on 26 and 27 October 1998, Amama Mbabazi, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs (regional cooperation) made the following statement, whose content the authorities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo have never refuged because they are so true:

> "The internal issues in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are as follows - tendencies towards genocide, our troops in eastern Congo have come across many massacres committed before our arrival and there were threats of more had we not arrived. Furthermore, there is evidence of extrajudicial massacres in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This evidence exists in Kisangani, Bunia and Moba. In Isiro, machetes were distributed in preparation for a possible genocide publicized by the Kabila Government officials on radio and television. This was done by those in authority before the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie rebels captured Isiro."

The leaders of the present regime promised to uphold human rights when they came to power, but their record has been lamentable. Unarmed civilian

opponents, journalists, as well as human rights activists, have been detained, tortured and government forces have repeatedly engaged in extrajudicial executions. Here below is another damning catalogue of gross violations confirmed by international human rights and humanitarian agencies. What we know for a fact is that Kabila has failed to abide by the binding norms of international humanitarian law applicable to current situations of armed conflict. In particular, the Democratic Republic of the Congo has refused to prohibit the targeting of civilians and civilian objects in military operations. The record of indiscriminate attacks is endless.

Furthermore, the authorities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo have not only failed to, but have resisted:

- Ensuring humane treatment for all persons detained in connection with the conflict;

- Permitting and facilitating access by relief assistance programmes so that non-combatants in war-affected areas may receive food, medicine and other relief, and providing safe land, river and air access for the provision of humanitarian aid;

- Permitting international and humanitarian agencies to visit persons detained in connection with the conflict;

- Prohibiting the recruitment and use of child soldiers and facilitating the demobilization, rehabilitation and return to society of such children;

- Investigating the violation of international humanitarian law by members of the Allied Democratic Forces for the Liberation of the Congo and holding them accountable for such abuses in procedures that meet the minimum standards of due process established in international humanitarian law.

In view of the above record, it is an unacceptable distortion of the truth for the authorities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to accuse Uganda of human rights violations against the Congolese. What we can conclude from this evidence is that the current conflict is the climax of massive human rights abuses and it has rightly been described by Amnesty International as a brutal reminder that stability and prosperity cannot be built on violations of human rights. It is these gross abuses of power that are fuelling the crisis. It is of course convenient for the authorities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to blame their neighbours, but that will not make the internal crisis go away.

An examination of the politics clearly exposes the bankruptcy of the allegations. What the world has seen is an appalling and disastrous political record. A record of political nepotism and exclusion. Numerous democratic opposition groups, which for years had battled against Mobutu's dictatorship, were excluded from power. Prominent among these is Etienne Tshise Ked, who was sent into internal exile. Criticism of the regime often resulted in imprisonment. Those who are lucky escaped by being removed from their jobs. What we see in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are the appalling results of

the absence of a credible open political system. Arbitrary rule, tribalism and nepotism have eroded the confidence of those Congolese who had fought and hoped that the fall of Mobutu would usher in democratic governance.

It is not Uganda that is responsible for the woes of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is the failed State at the centre whose connivance with and support of rebel groups based on its soil has forced its neighbours to defend themselves.

For example, Uganda has, for a very long time, been concerned by the Sudan-backed rebels who operate from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. These groups include the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF), the West Nile Bank as well as the Uganda National Rescue Front II. All these have secure bases in the Democratic Republic of the Congo from which they periodically invade Uganda and commit atrocities.

As a matter of fact, it is Uganda that has a serious case to make against the Democratic Republic of the Congo because of its connivance with the rebel movements based on its territory who have been responsible for crimes against humanity committed against Ugandans. Below are some of the details.
Colonel Ebemba, Mobutu's Commander, who planned and led ADF to attack Uganda on 13 November 1996, was redeployed in the eastern Province of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where ADF was operating from, by the Kabila regime. This meant that Ebemba would continue to facilitate ADF activities just as he used to do during the Mobutu days. He was transferred after Uganda bitterly protested.

Since 1996, ADF, from bases in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, has raided Uganda and killed many people, injured others and destroyed property. From November 1996, when ADF started its activities, until 24 November 1998, about 552 people have been killed, over 256 injured, 904 abducted and about 35,000 internally displaced. However, most of the abductees have been rescued. The most gruesome attack was the Kichwamba Technical College massacre of 8 June 1998 in western Uganda, in which over 80 students were burned to death and 100 abducted. The most prominent ADF attacks are the following:

Date	District	Place	People killed	People injured	Abducted
13 November 1996	Kasese	Mpondwe	20	-	400
30 April 1997	Kasese	Kasese	50	-	-
23 July 1997	Bundibugyo	Ntoroko	28	12	14
August 1997	Kabarole	Karambi	35	14	7
14 September 1997	Bundibugyo	Nyakahuka Refugee Camp	30	-	-
8 June 1998	Kasese	Kichwamba Technical College	Over 80	Several	100
1 August 1998	Kasese	Kasese Town	8	6	-

Conclusion

Uganda is not responsible for human rights abuses in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Uganda has committed no atrocities. On the contrary, Uganda is keen to see peace restored in the Democratic Republic of the Congo because the unstable situation there has created a colossal humanitarian problem and the destabilization of its neighbours. But, at the same time, we categorically state that, as the modalities and mechanisms for an immediate ceasefire in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are being worked out by the region, the fundamental issue of the crisis is the urgent need for internal dialogue between all Congolese parties. Much as the Democratic Republic of the Congo may wish to divert attention, we categorically say that it is through dialogue that all issues of concern to the Congolese parties will be mutually addressed and resolved. To this effect, the Democratic Republic of the Congo must accept the fact that there is internal resentment in the country and therefore the authorities should enter into direct negotiations with all the opposition groups. It is equally important to recognize that the security concerns of neighbouring countries are legitimate. Measures must be put in place to ensure that no security threats against its neighbours emanate from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

For its part, Uganda's immediate interests have always been and still are based on:

- The need to ensure total security in all parts of Uganda as well as the protection of lives and property of the people of Uganda;

- The desire to ensure maximum stability in the Great Lakes region since instability in any neighbouring country directly impinges on our own

security and economic resources. Moreover, we believe in the benefits that accrue from regional economic cooperation and integration.

These interests are legitimate and permanent. Our position on the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo therefore reflects our efforts to pursue those interests.

In doing so, Uganda is committed to the principle of non-interference and good neighbourliness in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. In its broader context, this principle guides our relations with all neighbouring countries, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/1181
16 December 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 DECEMBER 1998 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Coalition forces have begun operations against military targets in Iraq. Our ongoing military action is substantial. We are attacking Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programmes and its ability to threaten its neighbours.

Coalition forces are acting under the authority provided by the resolutions of the Security Council. This action is a necessary and proportionate response to the continued refusal of the Iraqi Government to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and the threat to international peace and security which Iraq's non-compliance represents. In carrying out this action, our forces have taken appropriate measures to defend themselves from any interference by Iraq, and have made every possible effort to avoid civilian casualties and collateral damage.

As the Council is well aware, this resort to military force was undertaken only when it became evident that diplomacy had been exhausted. The coalition acted out of necessity, and the Government of Iraq bears full responsibility for the consequences of this military operation. We did not act precipitately. On the contrary, the United States of America has worked with its partners in the Security Council over the past months in a sincere and sustained effort to bring about a peaceful resolution of the confrontation created by Iraq. For reasons best known to Saddam Hussein, Iraq chose to reject that effort.

Following the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi occupation in 1991, the Security Council, in its resolution 687 (1991) of 3 April 1991, mandated a ceasefire; but it also imposed a number of essential conditions on Iraq, including the destruction of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and acceptance by Iraq of United Nations inspections.

In its resolutions - including, in addition to resolution 687 (1991), resolutions 707 (1991) of 15 August 1991, 715 (1991) of 11 October 1991, 1154 (1998) of 2 March 1998, 1194 (1998) of 9 September 1998, 1205 (1998) of 5 November 1998 and others - the Council has elaborated and reiterated those conditions, including "full, final and complete disclosure" of all aspects of

its programmes to develop weapons of mass destruction, and "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access" for the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) "to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records and means of transportation which they wish to inspect." Iraqi compliance with all these requirements is a fundamental element of international peace and security in the region.

Nevertheless, Iraq has repeatedly taken actions which constitute flagrant, material breaches of these provisions. On a number of occasions, the Council has affirmed that similar Iraqi actions constituted such breaches, as well as a threat to international peace and security. In our view, the Council need not state these conclusions on each occasion.

Just one month ago, on 14 November 1998, the Government of Iraq committed itself to providing full and unconditional cooperation with UNSCOM, as required by Security Council resolutions. The Iraqi Government described it as a "clear and unconditional decision by the Iraqi Government to resume cooperation with UNSCOM and IAEA." Iraq stated that the weapons inspectors could "immediately resume all their activities according to the relevant resolutions of the Security Council." It must be noted that Iraq rescinded its restrictions on UNSCOM and IAEA and offered those assurances only in the face of a credible threat of force. Military force was not employed at that time, however, because the United States, along with other members of the Security Council, sought a peaceful resolution to the situation created by Iraq and opted to go the extra mile to test Iraqi intentions.

In that event, Iraq failed to fulfil its assurances. As the UNSCOM report of 15 December 1998 makes clear, Iraq failed to provide the full cooperation it promised on 14 November, and thus left UNSCOM unable to conduct the substantive disarmament work mandated to it by the Security Council.

By refusing to make available documents and information requested by UNSCOM within the scope of its mandate, by imposing new restrictions on the weapons inspectors and by repeatedly denying access to facilities which UNSCOM wished to inspect, Iraq, once again, acted in flagrant and material breach of Security Council resolution 687 (1991).

Following Iraq's repeated, flagrant and material breaches of its obligations under Security Council resolutions 687 (1991), 707 (1991), 715 (1991), 1154 (1998), 1194 (1998), 1205 (1998) and others - in addition to its failure to fulfil its own commitments - the coalition today exercised the authority given by the Security Council in its resolution 678 (1990) of 29 November 1990 for Member States to employ all necessary means to secure Iraqi compliance with the Council's resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area. Any Iraqi attempt to attack coalition forces or to initiate aggressive action against a neighbouring State will be met with a swift response by the coalition.

Iraq's policy of unremitting defiance and non-compliance necessitated the resort to military force. The United States did not seek a confrontation and did not undertake this decision lightly. The coalition now looks to the highest level of the Iraqi leadership for an immediate demonstration of unconditional compliance with the terms of the Security Council resolutions.

(Signed) A. Peter BURLEIGH
Chargé d'affaires a.i.